

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION, DIVERSITY, AND EQUITY

Thursday, February 2, 2017

Members/ alternates attending	Amani Nuru-Jeter (Chair, UCB), Tanya Golash-Boza (Vice Chair, UCM), Lok Siu (UCB), Bruce Haynes (UCD), Rufus Edwards (UCI), Catia Sternini (UCLA), Suveen Mathaudhu (sub, UCR), Rommie Amaro (UCSD), Linda Centore (sub, UCSF), Elizabeth Gwinn (via phone, UCSB), Sophia Armen (graduate student rep, UCSD), Jim Chalfant (Academic Council Chair, UCD), Shane White (Academic Council Vice Chair, UCLA)
Members absent	Clarissa Nobile (UCM), Miriam Greenberg (UCSC)
Consultants, guests, and staff	Susan Carlson (Vice Provost, Academic Personnel and Programs), Amy K. Lee (Diversity, Labor and Employee Relations Director), Joanne Miller (Committee Analyst)

**Meeting Minutes**

**1. Chair’s Report** –*Amani Nuru-Jeter, UCAADE Chair*

- Chair’s announcements

Chair Amani Nuru-Jeter provided an update on the comments submitted by UCAADE and other Academic Senate committees on nondiscrimination, faculty code of conduct, and other policies undergoing systemwide review. UCAADE had been investigating UC’s policies on discrimination when the joint Senate/Administration Committee was formed to make recommendations to strengthen UC’s policies on sexual violence and sexual harassment. Instead of working in parallel, UCAADE paused its work to wait for the results of the joint committee, which were the revisions to APM 015, 016, and Senate Bylaw 336 that were reviewed in the fall.

UCAADE submitted responses to Academic Council on the proposed revisions to APM 015, 016, and Senate Bylaw 336 in December. In January, UCAADE submitted a memo regarding proposed revisions (due to changes in state and federal law) to the Presidential Policy on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action and minor changes to APM 015.

The Academic Council [letter](#) that summarizes the Academic Senate review responses to the changes to APM 015 and 016 includes comments on more than the proposed revisions. UCAADE submitted a response prior to the deadline that focused on the proposed changes, but if the committee has more to say then UCAADE can send an additional memo.

The Academic Senate is responsible for making changes to its own bylaws. Within the next year, Senate Bylaws 335 and 336 will be revised to align with changes to APM 015 and 016. Changes will be sent to divisional Senates for review.

In addition to the above, UCAADE submitted comments on revisions to the new Presidential Policy on International Activities and the Proposed Revised Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST). All comments can be found on the Academic Senate website: <http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/reports-recommendations>

Finally, in November, UCAADE drafted a letter to Academic Council regarding letters of recommendation for freshman applicants.

Meeting minutes from Oct. 13, 2016 were approved.

## **2. Controversial speakers on campus (new topic)**

Protests became violent last night in opposition to a right-wing speaker who was invited to speak on campus. Members discussed the balance of free speech with the values of the University, (articulated in the [Principles of Community](#)). Concerns expressed by UCAADE members included a perceived inequity in who is permitted to speak on campus and the appropriation of left-wing language by the right. UCSJ graduate student Sophia Armen, the new student representative to UCAADE, provided useful information about how student groups allocate funding for outside speakers as well as advice for moving forward. She noted that student and faculty responses to past events have created the foundation for what actions can be taken now. The committee will use a Google doc for members to combine their thoughts and questions regarding free speech versus hate speech, and to report who on their campus deals with this. UCAADE will invite a representative from the Office of General Counsel to its upcoming meeting to discuss what can be done to prevent individuals espousing hateful views from being invited to campuses. The president of the student association will be invited as well.

Members said that in any statement, policy, or guidelines, it would be helpful to articulate terms about using student and/or university resources, reaffirming the goals of the free speech movement (which was driven by students, and protects students), and to stick with the framework of **what is speech, what is free speech, and what is hate speech** and not delve into specific types of content. Official statements can make these types of controversial events more difficult to justify, even if they do not have the rule of law. If possible, a well-thought out process for determining when negative speech becomes hate speech would be useful.

**Action:** Homework for next meeting: Committee members are asked to add comments to the Google doc (sent via email) before the next meeting.

## **3. Campus reports**

*Berkeley* – In addition to current concerns about potentially controversial speakers that are invited to the campus by student groups, Berkeley’s local committee is troubled by the rise of depression and anxiety among students, as concluded by a 2015 study. This has been confirmed anecdotally at Berkeley, and is worse since the election.

*UCSF:* The Vice Chancellor of Diversity and Outreach has been holding forums to address concerns around new travel restrictions. UCSF discussed what is known as the “95 percent rule,” a policy for allocating time to NIH grants. Five percent can cover other activities that are required of all faculty. The

UCSF's Equal Opportunity Committee is looking at the diversity of faculty award recipients and the composition of research funding award committees. Other topics this year include a faculty salary survey and an examination of the definition of "underrepresented minority," including the addition of historically disenfranchised populations.

*UCSD*: The local committee has chosen to focus on one or two items each year. UCSD ranks among the worst in the system in the diversity of the faculty. The committee is looking at "contributions to diversity" statements and how they are interpreted. The other focus is hostile campus climate issues.

*Riverside* is looking at diversity in faculty hiring. Although cluster hiring last year meant that over one hundred new faculty members were hired, there was no net increase in underrepresented minorities. The Academic Senate has not been able to obtain statistical data for applicants or those who may have turned down offers. Most of the hiring was delegated to deans. The campus should be able to get data on why faculty are leaving from last year's pilot study of faculty retention. There is conjecture that other universities are targeting Riverside's URM faculty. The campus modified its criteria for appointment and review of department chairs (APM 245) to include affirmative action goals, but there's a need for in-person diversity training.

*Davis* is continuing its chancellor search while the interim chancellor continues the same policies as his predecessor. The primary "diversity" office on campus, which is within Student Affairs, supports a Diversity and Inclusion Planning Committee that is investigating the creation of a new diversity plan. There is some concern that there are already diversity plans, and yet still the number of black faculty has declined. The local Senate committee is seeking justification for the creation of a new Associate Vice Chancellor of Diversity position. Another issue of concern is regarding an extra layer of review for hiring post-docs that was implemented without Senate consultation.

UC Davis has a program, STEAD<sup>1</sup> (Strength through Equity and Diversity) that might be explored as "best practices" for faculty search committees.

*UCLA*: Diversity and climate are the biggest issues. There are efforts in diversity in departmental review, but no templates and not enough data. The local committee is meeting with faculty equity advisors about their role in faculty searches. Every search committee member has to have diversity training. General climate concerns of the country as a whole are also a big concern of both faculty and students.

*Irvine*: In addition to issues already brought up, the local committee has been having discussions about their campus police force and is interested in learning about methods of oversight used on other campuses.

*UCSB* is interested in training for faculty who are serving on faculty search committees. There is currently none; UCSB does not have faculty equity advisors so the chair is supposed to flag concerns about equity. There is some belief that buy-in from faculty would negate the need for strong leadership in support of diversity at the top of the administration. There is need for help with understanding and dealing with implicit bias. The local committee is also looking at contributions to diversity statements and

---

<sup>1</sup> See: <http://academicaffairs.ucdavis.edu/training-and-development/stead/>

whether these are being submitted. It obtained data from CAP about how many faculty are submitting statements and what fraction are getting salary actions that reflect their efforts (regardless of whether they submitted a statement). The data shows very few diversity statements are submitted, but the percentage of faculty getting salary actions is higher when contributions to diversity are taken into consideration.

The local committee asked the EVC to apply to the Clare Booth Luce foundation for funding for start-up packages for women faculty in clinical sciences and engineering.

#### **4. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership - Letters of Recommendation**

*Jim Chalfant, Academic Council Chair*

*Shane White, Academic Council Vice Chair*

The Academic Council Chair and Vice Chair asked the committee to opine on the question of using letters of recommendation from freshman applicants. President Napolitano charged the Academic Council with developing a single systemwide policy with respect to letters of recommendation that can be applied consistently to freshman applicants across all nine undergraduate campuses. Primary responsibility for responding to the President was delegated to BOARS, with input from UCAADE. Members discussed the use of holistic review and whether letters of recommendation should be invited. UC Berkeley is currently in the second year of a two year pilot of an alternate admissions process that has prompted criticism from the Academic Council for its incorporation of letters of recommendation for some applicants. Committee members noted that there is limited evidence that letters of recommendation provide any information in predicting student success, yet there is a very real possibility of placing burdens on already-burdened high school teachers and counselors. Faculty diversity best practices recommends against the use of letters of recommendation.

After thoughtful discussion, UCAADE recommended that UC *not* require or broadly invite letters of recommendation as part of its admissions application process.

#### **5. APM 210-1-d follow-up**

*Chair Amani Nuru-Jeter*

The committee briefly discussed the first year outcomes of how divisional CAPs are treating the “contributions to diversity” statement that was added to APM 210-1-d. Results from UCAP’s annual survey were provided as background. Some campuses seem to be making more use of the new criteria than others. UCAADE will follow up on this issue at future meetings.

#### **6. Systemwide Review Items**

The committee did not discuss the systemwide policies under review, but Committee Analyst Joanne Miller will ask UCSF representative Kathy Julian whether she has anything to add from a Health Science campus perspective.

#### **7. Consultation with UCOP - Academic Personnel and Programs**

*Susan Carlson, Vice Provost*

*Amy K. Lee, Diversity, Labor and Employee Relations Director*

- *Feedback on the UCAADE memo on faculty salary equity studies.*

Vice Provost Susan Carlson's office is responsible for maintaining faculty salary equity studies, which have revealed a number of issues. A formal review of the process in 2018 will help to determine next steps for conducting faculty equity studies, so the information gathered from the review of UCAADE's recommendations has been timely. The next phase for the studies will be different than what was done in 2012. Carlson noted that equity *has* been addressed, to a certain extent, but off scales are pervasive. Regardless, she acknowledged the benefit of standardizing surveys to the extent possible.

UCAADE's "Suggestions for future faculty salary equity analyses" that were sent to Academic Council in October were meant to provide guidance. Almost all of the feedback on that document from the campuses mentioned the need for more resources to do the studies. It might make sense to bring experts together to talk about parameters and ways to go forward. That would help with bringing a reasonable proposal to President Napolitano.

**Action:** Committee members were asked to go back to their local committees and ask if faculty salary equity studies can be on the agenda. [Merced, San Diego, Santa Barbara and Santa Cruz have already submitted responses.] Suggestions for UCAADE members:

1. Not all CAADs are involved in the survey, so some committees might need to find out who on the campus is responsible.
2. Recommendations for future studies should also be discussed at divisional council meetings. Let division chairs know that Susan Carlson will be reaching out to administrators and that your committee will be reaching out to campus administrators.
3. Consider meeting jointly with Faculty Welfare or other relevant committee (or committee chair) at the local level. If you are not the chair, ask your chair if it can be added to the agenda.

**Action:** UCAADE will ask for a short amount of time on next Academic Council agenda for faculty salary study recommendations.

**Action:** At some point next year, UCAADE will schedule a meeting with experts about future faculty salary equity studies and remediation to try to find some consensus.

- *Update on efforts by the AA/EEO Directors*

The AA/EEO Directors are having an in-person meeting on April 17-18. Chair Nuru-Jeter will look into attending.

- *"Contributions to diversity" language in the draft APM 285 policy language - LSOE*

Revisions to APM 285 were reviewed in a limited "management review" process this fall and will be coming soon for systemwide review. Part of the revision is the inclusion of language equivalent to 210-1-d, although it differs slightly due to differences in research requirements.

- *\$2 million diversity initiative – update*

The three pilot programs are underway at Davis, Riverside, and San Diego. VP Carlson's office has found comparators so that the programs can show results.

- ***Faculty Retention and Exit Survey (Discuss whether UCAADE should send a letter of support)***

VP Carlson received a letter of support for the Faculty Retention and Exit Survey from UCFW via Academic Council. No additional letter is needed. UC Recruit is tracking and gathering the data that is used in the survey. Carlson understands the campus concerns about attrition.

Campuses were given the option to participate again, with a portion of the fee paid through UCOP. Five campuses have said yes, three have said no. Some campuses realized in the first round that they did not have good methods for retention data collection.

- ***Collective excellence***

Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies Art Ellis joined the meeting to introduce the draft document, “The Pursuit of Collective Excellence in Research at the University of California.” The intent of the paper is to provide guidance for individual and academic reviews for more recognition of both individual and collective research excellence. The Vice Chancellors of Research have endorsed the document. Other groups, such as the graduate deans and UCORP, are suggesting new types of contributions to add. UCAP has asked that it be sent around to divisional CAPs. VP Ellis will continue to talk with committees and EVCs, and may send to campus academic senates by the summer.

Members asked about separating “globally-engaged” and “diverse” and the possibility of systemwide incentives for specific endeavors. There was some discussion about the vision for having this actually count, for example in promotions and departmental review. The original idea was to have it be a part of the APM – some of the sections haven’t been changed in decades. But that was deemed to be unnecessary. The group offered words of encouragement for the overall intent of the document. UCAADE will come back to the document before the end of the academic year and determine whether to endorse.

**Action:** Send suggestions for the document to Chair Nuru-Jeter (anjeter@berkeley.edu) and Committee Analyst Joanne Miller (Joanne.Miller@ucop.edu) before the April UCAADE meeting.

## **8. Faculty Diversity Issues at UC**

In relation to the discussion on faculty retention, UCAADE members noted that diversity in hiring is a lot more straightforward and solvable than campus climate, which may be influencing decisions to separate from the university. It was suggested that, in some cases, a provost needs to speak out on the issue and say it has total support from the administration.

In trying to find ways to improve campus faculty diversity and address climate issues, one idea that came up is to require campuses to submit annual reports on diversity hiring. Chancellors already submit reports to the President, but there is no incentive/disincentive program. Members suggested that this become a UC priority, with associated resources committed to it (such as start-up costs for diversity hires). UCAADE agreed that it would prepare these concerns into a format appropriate to bring directly to President Napolitano, who will be invited to an upcoming UCAADE meeting. [Note: The UCAADE meeting with the President is scheduled for May 11.]

**Action:** A link will be sent out to a shared Google doc. Members should add ideas, proposals, evidence (even anecdotal), to discuss in April and prepare a proposal for presentation to the President. Chair Amani Nuru-Jeter will bring the proposal to Academic Council first (for April 26).

The guidelines from the Office of General Counsel “Addressing Race and Gender Equity in Academic Programs in Compliance with Proposition 209” are linked from the UCAADE Resources page: <http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/committees/ucaade/resources.html>

**9. Statement from UCFW on President Trump’s Executive Order Regarding Immigration**

By majority vote, UCAADE agreed to endorse the UCFW statement.

**10. Follow-up items**

Upcoming issues for UCAADE include more on campus diversity and follow-up regarding systemwide efforts around police oversight at UC.

-----

*Meeting adjourned at 4:08pm*  
*Meeting minutes drafted by Joanne Miller, Committee Analyst*  
*Attest: Amani Nuru-Jeter, UCAADE Chair*